

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
STANDARD OF REVIEW	2
FACTS	3
As Regards the First Cause of Action:	3
Additional Facts Relevant to the First Cause of Action Not Required to Be Plead:	5
As Regards the Second Cause of Action:	6
Additional Facts Relevant to the Second Cause of Action Not Required to Be Plead:	7
ARGUMENT	8
POINT I. THE FELA ITSELF DEFINES THE NON-DELEGABLE DUTY OF THE RAILROAD TO PROVIDE ITS EMPLOYEES WITH A SAFE WORKPLACE AND WITH SAFE EQUIPMENT AND TOOLS WITH WHICH TO WORK	8
A) THE FELA	8
B) DUTY OF RAILROAD TO ITS EMPLOYEES	9
D) STANDARD OF CARE UNDER FELA	11
E) CAUSATION UNDER THE FELA	12
F) QUANTUM OF EVIDENCE NECESSARY TO MAKE OUT A PRIMA FACIE CASE	13
G) NO ASSUMPTION OF RISK	14
POINT II. PLAINTIFF HAS PROPERLY PLEAD CAUSES OF ACTION FOR THE MTA’S VIOLATION OF THE FELA’S STATUTORILY IMPOSED DUTY	15
With regard to the First Cause of Action:	15

a)	Plaintiff Has Properly Plead The Necessary Elements of A Cause of Action Under the FELA, Inclusive of Negligence Occurring Within the Scope of or Incidental to His Employment With the Defendant Railroad	15
b)	Because Daniel Bruno Sues for “New” Injuries Caused by Specific Railroad Employees on a Different Date of Accident, Defendant’s Affirmative Defenses of Res Judicata, Accord and Satisfaction and the Prior Settlement Agreement Do Not Act to Bar the First Cause of Action	16
	With regard to the Second Cause of Action:	17
c)	Because FELA Adopts a “Discovery” Rule, Plaintiff’s Second Cause of Action is not Barred by the FELA’s Three Year Statute of Limitations	17
d)	Plaintiff Has Properly Plead The Necessary Elements of A Cause of Action Under the FELA, Inclusive of Negligence Occurring Within the Scope of or Incidental to His Employment With the Defendant Railroad	18
e)	DANIEL Bruno’s Injuries Were Incidental to His Employment in Interstate Commerce by Rail Inasmuch as it Was His Railroad Employer Who Assigned Him to Work at or near the Vicinity of “Ground Zero”	20
f)	The FELA is DANIEL BRUNO’s Exclusive Remedy as Against His Employer for the Personal Injuries He Sustained as a Result of Negligently Being Assigned By His Employer to Work at or near the Vicinity of the September 11, 2001 Terror Attacks Perpetrated Upon the World Trade Center and Therefore Is Not Preempted by ATSSA	20
	CONCLUSION	22